

Appl. No. 09/705,035

Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 2 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2 and 10 are amended herein. Applicants believe the rejections have been overcome for at least the reasons below.

In the Office Action claims 1-8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Patent Office objected to the phrase "wherein said second electrode is attached to the audible sound generating means which receives signals from the playback apparatus." See, Office Action, page 3. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to recite, at least in part, wherein said second electrode is adapted to receive the audio modulated signal sent from an audio-signal transmission apparatus. Furthermore, in response, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite, at least in part, wherein a second electrode is used for receiving a signal sent from the audio-signal transmission apparatus. Support for these amendments is found at page 13, lines 20-22 of the specification, as also indicated by the Examiner. See, Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 2, 10 and claims 3-8, 11 and 12 that depend therefrom fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants request that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in light of the amendments made above, and respectfully submit that such rejections be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BY Thomas C. Basso (46,541)  
Customer No. 29175Dated: November 28, 2005